

Date: Thu, 25 Aug 94 04:30:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #391
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 25 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 391

Today's Topics:

100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination
CW ...IS NOW! (3 msgs)
Easy CW tests...
FLAME the FCC
Motorola HT's WANTED!!!!
Reply to Peter Laws (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 1994 05:43:00 EST
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ames.arpa
Subject: 100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

steve@sheridan.ncd.com (Steve Wilson) writes:

>In article <33atdm\$se6@agate.berkeley.edu>, kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken
A. Nishimura) writes:

{deleted to save bandwidth}

>|> * If transfers of trusteeships are allowed, do aspiring repeater
>|> owners who want to put up new boxes have to wait forever as
>|> a pair will never "open" but be transferred ad infinitum?
>

>Yep. Either that are put some hardware up on 1200! That's what a lot
>of people are doing today.(Just like Ken say he's doing in his post ;-)

Oh MY GOD Steve, what a RADICAL concept!!! Open up a NEW and little used band! Actually move UP in frequency! Good GOD NO! Gee, there are only about 90 un-used 900mhz pairs (something like that) around here. And (as you said) 1200 is just waiting to be explored.

I was woundering if anyone else would comment on this first. Thanks Steve. As Steve said; If you want a repeater that bad (as a trustee or user) and all the pairs are full on 2-meter, try 440. Oh, 440 is full (guess what it wasn't when the first few repeaters went up because 2-meters was crowded or for some other reason not desireable). Try 900 or 1.2. LOTS more bands up there.

I have an idea. Might spur some advances. We should set asside ONE nation wide 2-meter pair (create it from simplex areas or something if needed, with and odd split if needed) for repeater use in an UNCOORDINATED state. In otherwords, want a repeater of your own, go ahead. But you get NO protection from interference from others on that pair. Youz gots to work out the problez youz selfz. Cooperation and all would be the only way to have a usefull system BUT NO COORDINATION, NO PROTECTION. Has to be technical solutions and inter-system cooperation. Just a thought, any ideas?

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 94 21:02:00 -0400

From: news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@uunet.uu.net

Subject: CW ...IS NOW!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

CC>In article <40.3229.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com

CC>(Alan Wilensky) writes:

CC>>

BTW, did everyone out there read the post

CC>>from the USCG man saying that CW training was dropped in '93?

CC>Yes, but when I inquired about the 5870 KHz broadcasts in CW, he said

CC>that is just an automated weather product. Then when I inquired as

CC>to who it was being broadcast to and why, the link went dead.

CC>Scratch one kosher meal, I guess. ;-)

You dont seem to put much weight on the fact that the USCG has stopped morse training, as have the Maritime academies. You seem to be holding onto straws.

You dont agree there is a serious errosion of CW in commercial use? My research shows this to be true.

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0
abm@world.std.com

, CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 1994 16:54:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!emory!nnntp.msstate.edu!
ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <40.3245.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

>CC>that is just an automated weather product. Then when I inquired as
>CC>to who it was being broadcast to and why, the link went dead.

Probably a communication equipment failure--should have been using CW, oops they are no longer proficient in CW. Too bad.

>You dont seem to put much weight on the fact that the USCG has stopped
>morse training, as have the Maritime academies. You seem to be holding
>onto straws.

>You dont agree there is a serious errosion of CW in commercial use? My
>research shows this to be true.

Just because these services are jeopardizing our safety trying to shave a buck or two off of operator training by eliminating CW does not give me great comfort. Does knowing that the new radio operator in the shack of your cruise ship can't send or receive CW make you feel safer? Well regardless of their maritime training, you can rest assured that if they have a general class or better amateur radio operating license and have spent any time on the air using CW they will be able to send or receive the Morse code sufficiently. Maybe that is why you find some of the ship lines still advertising in the back of QST for radio operators.

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX

wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 1994 06:00:00 EST
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
news.umbc.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ames.arpa
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

>
>CC>In article <40.3229.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com
>CC>(Alan Wilensky) writes:
>CC>> BTW, did everyone out there read the post
>CC>>from the USCG man saying that CW training was dropped in '93?
>
>CC>Yes, but when I inquired about the 5870 KHz broadcasts in CW, he said
>CC>that is just an automated weather product. Then when I inquired as
>CC>to who it was being broadcast to and why, the link went dead.
>
>CC>Scratch one kosher meal, I guess. ;-)
>
>You dont seem to put much weight on the fact that the USCG has stopped
>morse training, as have the Maritime academies. You seem to be holding
>onto straws.
>
>You dont agree there is a serious errosion of CW in commercial use? My
>research shows this to be true.

"Errosion", Alan? Isn't that like calling the Pacific a "puddle"? "All
but eliminated" maybe, "errosion"? A bit of an understatement, to say
the least.

Dan N8PKV

--
"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 94 21:14:02 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Easy CW tests...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In addition, you don't need to pass the code and theory elements on the same day.

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 1994 05:24:00 EST
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ames.arpa
Subject: FLAME the FCC
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

plaws@comp..uark.edu (Peter Laws) writes:

>William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:
>
>>them professionally. They alone aren't responsible for who won the elections
>>nor did they ever expect the interest in amateur radio licenses we see today.
>
>Absolutely correct! That early '70s Honeywell was working just fine. If
>the Republicans were still in, they would certainly never have wasted
>money on new information systems. Progress? Who needs that?

Gee, guess you don't know much about how government spends money huh?
Well, if it is being installed this year it was proposed a LONG time ago
and the money was allocated maybe 4 to 10 years ago. (Which puts it in
either the Reagan or Bush Presidency, Republican I believe.) And besides
that, the CONGRESS appropriates monies for government spending. The House
has been controled by the Democrats for, oh, 40 years or so. And, gasp,
the Senate is too. Golly, guess the guys that appropriate the funds aren't
mostly Republican after all.

(Sorry for the off topic response.)

>For those who didn't see the post earlier in the summer, the main cause of
>the delays (or so we're told :) is the installation of the new license-
>processing system. Once it was installed, temps were hired to start in on
>the backlog (allegedly 15,000 610s at the time). Too bad they didn't
>understand FIFO - bunches of folks got tickets in < 7 weeks. The average
>delay is closer to 14 weeks, with gusts to 17 (based on usenet posts).

A new system is installed, problems always arise. You try and keep them
small but there are some areas that suffer in some installations. Now, the
ARS is at the bottom of the priority list (and appropriatly so) therefore

we experiance some delays but the system will improve with the new
comuputer(s). At least they waited until after the LARGE influx just after
Feburary of 1991.

>If the "somebody" who posted that info originally (re: the new system)
>could post it again maybe we could cut down these circular threads ...

Maybe we should have an FAQ. :-)

>(BTW, when Luck Hurder still worked at the ARRL, he would weigh in with
>good info about stuff like this. They fired him. Too bad.)

Well, maybe we agree. Luck was a VERY valuable source of information and
help.

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 94 18:19:00 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!nntp-server.caltech.edu!news.claremont.edu!
kaiwan.com!ledge!darryl.linkow@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Motorola HT's WANTED!!!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

8/23/94

Hello all! I am in IMMEDIATE NEED of some Motorola
walkie-talkies. I am looking for either Motorola HT-600,
MT-1000, or Motorola Radius P200 units. They must be 5 Watt
units and have at least 6 channels and must cover the 157-174 Mhz.
range. I am also interested in accesories for these units, such as
speaker/microphones, headsets, etc. Let me know what you have.
WILL PAY CASH or can trade for hardware and/or software items
from my ads. Leave message here or give me a call.

Darryl Linkow

(818) 346-5278 9 am - 5 pm PDT

(The VERY BEST time to reach me is ANY MORNING right at 9 am PDT)

* OLX 2.2 * Darryl Linkow (818)346-5278 9 am - 5 pm PDT

Date: 24 Aug 94 15:46:04 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Reply to Peter Laws
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Peter:

Actually, if the system was installed early this past year, then the money was appropriated during a Republican administration with a Democratic Congress. You forget that Hillary's budget didn't start until fiscal 1994 which begins in October 1993. Fiscal 1993 was still George Bush's even though he was out of office for most of that year.

Hillary's changes to government are just now taking effect a full 20 months after taking office. (Oh, I forgot some of you folks thought you elected Bill. Don't blame me, I voted for someone ELSE).

A curious situation, no?

Ray
WD5IFS
mack@mails.imed.com

Date: 24 Aug 1994 17:02:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!koriel!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Reply to Peter Laws
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9407247777.AA777750985@mails.imed.com> mack@mails.imed.COM (Mack Ray) writes:

> Actually, if the system was installed early this past year, then
> the money was appropriated during a Republican administration with a
> Democratic Congress. You forget that Hillary's budget didn't start
> until fiscal 1994 which begins in October 1993.

Hello! Earth to Republicans! October 1993 is about a year ago.

--
Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 24 Aug 1994 10:16:37 -0600
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <33atdm\$se6@agate.berkeley.edu>, <33duol\$t3n\$1@rosebud.ncd.com>,
<082494054309Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: 100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination

In article <082494054309Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> wrote:
>I have an idea. Might spur some advances. We should set asside ONE nation
>wide 2-meter pair (create it from simplex areas or something if needed,
>with and odd split if needed) for repeater use in an UNCOORDINATED
>state. In otherwords, want a repeater of your own, go ahead. But you get
>NO protection from interference from others on that pair. Youz gots to
>work out the problez youz selfz. Cooperation and all would be the only way
>to have a usefull system BUT NO COORDINATION, NO PROTECTION. Has to be
>technical solutions and inter-system cooperation. Just a thought, any
>ideas?

We're ahead of you. 145.25 in Texas is as you describe, with one other
requirement: you must have CTCSS. Since nobody wanted that pair anyway due to
CATV interference, it was a natural.

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"From now on, when someone asks you where you're from, you tell 'em
'Houston, city of champions!'" -- Rudy Tomjanovich

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 1994 12:30:46 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORN.L.GOV!
xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@ames.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug23.012847.29853@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<wyn.149.2E59FAC4@ornl.gov>, <1994Aug23.204152.19994@mixcom.mixcom.com>.ornl.go
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

In article <1994Aug23.204152.19994@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>Yes. We ARE a service, right? To continue to provide "service" we must
>remain technically viable, right? We must COMPETE for spectrum access
>with other COMMUNICATION services, right?

I don't think so. I believe the service was created to spare the commercial
world of any competitive notions the operators might have. Ops are not allowed
to do the things that would compete with commercial services, like charge

money for air time, broadcast, carry business oriented traffic, etc. Part 97 speaks clearly (or it used to) on this subject.

>>>We are NOT asking for a free ride

More and more, it appears that "we" are asking for a free ride, just another hitch hiker on the RF highways, dodging those commercial common carrier tariffs. Your explanation of the situation using the OSI model points that out. Let the physical layer be a common carrier, just like ethernet cable. Don't bother me with things like propagation, gentlemen's agreements, allocations, etc. Just give me good S/N, plenty of bandwidth and let me do my "advanced communications" stuff on the higher levels, as long as it is free of course.

The frustrated Amateurs Into Digital Stuff and Amateur Network Utilitization Teams should try fiber optics. Great advances in that area. QRM proof, no EMI in or out, now up to 1 Gigabit/sec/mile without repeaters or amps. Oh, and you don't have to ever worry again about the ARRL, or those troublesome CW requirements.

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #391
